

Service Coordination Board

1 March 2012 Meeting Summary

In attendance:

AES: Geoff Pile, John Maclean

ASD: Michael Borland

XSD: Mark Beno, Chris Jacobsen, Francesco De Carlo

Upgrade: Dean Haeffner, Mohan Ramanathan

Makeup of the Board: Jacobsen and Beno will represent XSD. In the near term Haeffner and Ramanathan will represent the upgrade project, it is expected that Tom Fornek to join. Borland will talk to Zholents regarding a 2nd ASD representative. [Following the meeting ASD identified Ali Nassiri as a proposed 2nd ASD representative.] What constitutes a quorum will need to be decided.

Support for the Board: Davey will assist with the Project Proposal System (PPS) & general administration; and the services of Trish Mast, a project management expert, will become available.

The Upgrade/Division Effort Request Agreements (ERAs) are under development will address number of the upgrade-related allocation of staffing issues that the Board faces.

Pile presented some ideas for discussion, his slides can be found at

https://icmsdocs.aps.anl.gov/docs/groups/aps/@ald/@dd/@add/@gl/@gm/documents/presentation/aps_1428722~1.pdf.

Ensuring support for day-to-day activities, beyond *projects*, is a priority for XSD management. Jacobsen also noted that the perspective should be completion of projects not just the provision of “services.” Progress should be monitored against benchmarks not just reports of effort allocated and expended. It was discussed that there is a need to track how daily effort is being spent and ensuring that it is being efficiently used. “Green sheet” tracking will provide a detailed accounting of where individuals are spending their time.

Pile suggested that the Board fix the times for meeting and eventually meet twice per month:

1st of the month – evaluate current and new proposals/requests

15th of the month – evaluate reports

22nd of the moth provide output to the DDs

Pile listed project tracking tools currently in use: new & old project prop system (PPS); spread sheets; MS Project (used for shutdowns w/o logic); and P6. He noted that the project management tools used by the Board need to integrate with the Upgrade’s P6 and be considered for better shutdown planning

Jacobsen: if the Board gets the information it doesn't matter what project management tool generated the report. Progress will need to be tracked and means for scientist to provide feedback is needed.

An active discussion followed that highlighted that a lack of a clear feedback processes has contributed to a sense of dissatisfaction.

Borland suggested that a simple feedback tool be made available (e.g., an email with a direct link asking if the work was performed satisfactorily, maybe on a scale of 1 to 10). Jacobsen suggested that you can't complain if you don't provide feedback – there has to be a straightforward way to provide feedback. Differing views on the IT Help Desk were shared. Feedback needs to be graded, more input sought for larger project, less for smaller tasks.

Pile presented an idea for the formation of dedicated teams for small tasks:

Beamline Teams: ~17 sectors of internal beamlines need support, expecting to grow to ~20 sectors in the near future; five teams might be formed for small beamline tasks:

Typical Beam Line Engineering Team (5 – Teams Total)	Head count	FTE%
Lead Physicist(Feed Back)	1	
Liaison Engineer (mech)	4 x 10%	40
Liaison Engineer (BCDA/elec)	1	
Liaison IT	1	
Embedded Engineer	1	90
Embedded Designer	1	90
Liaison Engineer System Interlocks	1	10
ESH/Floor Coordinator	1	90

ASD team might be formed for small tasks:

Accelerator Engineering Team	Head count	FTE%
Machine managers(Feed Back)	1	
Embedded Engineer (mech)	2 ?	180
Liaison Engineer (elec)	1	
Liaison IT	1	
Embedded Engineer (RF ctls)	1	90
Embedded Designers (1 for RF & PS – 1 for Mech Engineering)	2	180
Embedded MOM Techs (RF)	2	180
Liaison Engineer ACIS +System Interlocks	1	10

It was noted that if resources are planned for a project (e.g., the Upgrade) but not used, the costs fall back on the operations budget. Green Sheet system will track where effort has been spent.

Jacobsen reminded the Board that the bureaucratic burden for small tasks should be minimized.

Haeffner raised the question as to who should provide progress reports the service provider or the receiver of the services – the customer may have a different perspective than the service provider.

Action items:

1. Board to meet again in two weeks (Pile to schedule)
2. Thresholds need to be defined for small/medium/large jobs (Jacobsen)
3. The ERAs need to be reviewed (Mohan)
4. Update current, realistic effort allocations to be presented to the Board (Pile)
5. Present an example of the level of details sought for a project (Pile)